

## REMARKS

In the final Office Action mailed March 30, 2007, the Examiner noted that claims 1 and 3-10 were pending and rejected claims 1 and 3-10. Claims 1 and 10 have been amended, no claims have been canceled, no new claims have been added and, thus, in view of the forgoing claims 1 and 3-10 remain pending for reconsideration which is requested. No new matter has been added. The Examiner's rejections are traversed below.

On July 17, 2007 an Interview was conducted with the Examiner and the substance of the discussion is set forth below.

## REJECTIONS under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1, 3-5, and 7-10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Skinner, U.S. Patent No. 6,703,930, and further in view of Bloomfield, U.S. Patent No. 5,446,445. Skinner discusses a system and method for detecting an event and then notifying the user of the event. Bloomfield discusses a system and method of notifying a central system of an event detected by a mobile detection system. In contrast, the present invention is to a robot which has been programmed to detect a number of user request, when these request occur the robot wirelessly communicates to another communication system and transmits a pre-recorded message to an emergency responder associated with the telephone number called.

The Examiner asserts on page 4 of the final Office Action, that the combination of Skinner and Bloomfield teach "a detection section which detects a plurality of user requests provided by a user," as in claim 1. Specifically, the Examiner asserts that this feature is taught by Skinner Fig. 1 and col. 7, lines 15-29 and 62-67 which states:

As described above, the controller 104 preferably contains a sequence of computer-executable steps 106. The computer-executable steps 106 are preferably configured and/or configurable to provide routing instructions and other processing for any incoming signals which are sent to the controller 104 by the sensors 102. That is, the **computer-executable steps 106 can be configured (for example, via the user interface 108)** to cause a given signal to be identified as to the location and nature of the respective event in response to which the signal was sent by the respective sensor 102. When I say "nature" in regard to an event, I mean a characteristic of event. That is, the nature of a given event can refer to whether the event is a fire, a flood, etc. In addition, the nature of an event can refer to the location of the event, among other characteristics. [Emphasis added]

Thus, what the Examiner cited discusses that the computer executable steps can be configured (i.e. programmed) via a user interface. Programming via an interface is quite different than a

detection unit that receives user input of a plurality of possible requests. The Examiner does not assert and the Applicant has not found that Bloomfield teaches such a feature. Therefore, Skinner and Bloomfield taken separately or in combination, fail to teach or suggest “a detection section which detects a plurality of user requests provided by a user,” as in claim 1.

The Examiner asserts on page 4 of the final Office Action, that the combination of Skinner and Bloomfield teach “a storing section which stores telephone numbers, wherein each of the telephone numbers is associated with a respective emergency reporting item comprising a priority sequence, a designation mode of one of the user requests and an associated message,” as in claim 1. The Examiner specifically states this feature is taught by Skinner col. 7, lines 15-29 and col. 7 lines 62 through col. 9 line 8. While Skinner as cited does discuss a method by which a message is sent to a user, it does not teach or suggest a “designation mode,” as in the present claims. As discussed above, Skinner and Bloomfield do not discuss user input. The “designation mode” is a manner of detecting what was inputted. Further, the Examiner does not assert and the Applicant has not found that Bloomfield teaches such a feature either. Therefore, Skinner and Bloomfield taken separately or in combination, fail to teach or suggest “a storing section which stores telephone numbers, wherein each of the telephone numbers is associated with a respective emergency reporting item comprising a priority sequence, **a designation mode of one of the user requests** and an associated message,” as in claim 1 or “detecting from among any of a plurality of emergency requests stored in a memory in a priority sequence with an **associated designation mode** and telephone number, an emergency request,” as in claim 10. (Emphasis added).

For at least the reasons stated above, Skinner and Bloomfield taken separately or in combination, fail to teach or suggest the elements of claims 1 and 10 and the claims dependent therefrom.

In addition, claim 1 has been amended to emphasize “a detection section which detects a plurality of user requests, provided by a user, via an input device upon occurrence of an event.” As discussed with the Examiner, Skinner and Bloomfield do not teach or suggest such.

Claim 10, though of a different scope, also emphasizes a similar feature.

For at least the reasons stated above, Skinner and Bloomfield taken separately or in combination, fail to teach or suggest the elements of claims 1 and 10 and the claims dependent therefrom.

As regards dependent claim 3, the Examiner asserts that the combination of Skinner and

Bloomfield teach “further comprising a microphone and a speaker, and wherein the telephone control section causes, after delivering the associated message to the receiver, the communication section to be in a state of communication using the microphone and the speaker,” as in claim 3. The Examiner asserts that Bloomfield, column 21 lines 1 through col. 22 lines 67. The invention as in claim 1 allows the user to input a designation mode which allows a communication to be sent to a third party, such as police or fire. The present claim allows the user then to further communicate with the fire department or police department after a recorded message is sent to the police or fire departments. This is different than what is discussed in Bloomfield where the microphone is used as part of the detecting mechanism, such as detecting a baby crying. The Examiner does not assert and the Applicant has not found that Skinner teaches such a feature either. Therefore, Skinner and Bloomfield taken separately or in combination, fail to teach or suggest “a microphone and a speaker, and wherein the telephone control section causes, after delivering the associated message to the receiver, the communication section to be in a state of communication using the microphone and the speaker,” as in claim 3.

Claims 1, 3-5, and 7-10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Kawakita, International Publication No. WO 99/67067, and further in view of Skinner.

The Examiner asserts on page 8 of the final Office Action, that the combination of Kawakita and Skinner teach “a detection section which detects a plurality of user requests provided by a user,” as in claim 1. Specifically, the Examiner asserts that this feature is taught by Kawakita, paragraphs 0078 and 0087-0088. Paragraph 0078 simply discusses the placement of a phone call where the user enters a phone number. Paragraphs 0087-0088 discuss movements that a robot would make when detecting a predetermined phrase. Thus, what Examiner has cited does not discuss detecting requests. As cited Kawakita, discusses no request. Meaning the purpose is not to detect an emergency as in the present claims, but to simply give a robot some dog like quality where in response to a phrase it wags its tail. As discussed above, Skinner does not teach or suggest this claimed feature. Therefore, Kawakita and Skinner taken separately or in combination, fail to teach or suggest “a detection section which detects a plurality of user requests provided by a user,” as in claim 1.

Further, on page 9 of the final Office Action, the Examiner states that “Kawakita does not teach of a plurality of messages respectively associated with the plurality of telephone numbers and the telephone control section dialing a telephone number according to a mode of request detected by the detection section, and delivering a message associated with the dialed telephone

telephone number. However, in the same field of endeavor" Skinner does. As discussed above, Skinner does not teach or suggest a "designation mode." As the Examiner admits that Kawakita is deficient for such a feature, Kawakita and Skinner taken separately or in combination, fail to teach or suggest "a storing section which stores telephone numbers, wherein each of the telephone numbers is associated with a respective emergency reporting item comprising a priority sequence, **a designation mode of one of the user requests** and an associated message," as in claim 1 or "detecting from among any of a plurality of emergency requests stored in a memory in a priority sequence with an **associated designation mode** and telephone number, an emergency request," as in claim 10. (Emphasis added).

For at least the reasons stated above, Kawakita and Skinner taken separately or in combination, fail to teach or suggest the elements of claims 1 and 10 and the claims dependent therefrom.

Claim 6 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Kawakita and Skinner as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Kataoka, U.S. Patent Application No. 2002/0181723. Kataoka adds nothing to Kawakita and Skinner as applied to independent claim 1. Therefore, Kawakita, Skinner and Kataoka taken separately or in combination fail to teach or suggest the elements of claim 6.

Withdrawal of the rejections is respectfully requested.

## SUMMARY

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: August 30, 2007

By: /J. Randall Beckers/

J. Randall Beckers  
Registration No. 30,358

1201 New York Avenue, NW, 7th Floor  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
Telephone: (202) 434-1500  
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501